

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 11, 12, 18, and 22-23 are amended. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11-24 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 11, 12, 18, 22, and 23 are amended herein to delete the phrase "wired and/or wireless" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 1 is amended to recite an access restriction method "for a device control system comprising a device control server interconnected over home network with a plurality of different types of devices within a home and a single operating terminal capable of transmission of instruction signals to said plurality of devices, the instruction signals relating to operation of said plurality of devices that are connected on the home network."

Claims 11, 18, 22, and 23 are similarly amended. Dependent claim 12 is amended to correspond to claim 11, as amended herein.

Support for the amendments is found, for example on page 26, line 17 to page 27, line 9 of the specification.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Item 4: Rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-9 and 11-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner asserts the rejection is proper since each of the independent claims recites wired "and/or" wireless transmission, but the specification does not discuss wired "and" wireless transmission.

Claims 1, 11, 12, 18, 22, and 23 are amended herein to delete the phrase "wired and/or wireless."

Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, 12, 18, 22, and 23, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Item 6: Rejection of claims 1, 9, 11 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes (U.S.P. 5,875,395)

Item 12: Rejection Of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Yatsukawa (U.S.P. 6,148,404)

Items 8-15: Rejection Of claims 2-8, 10, 12-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes in view of combinations of Buffam (U.S.P. 6,185,316), Sizer, II et al. (U.S.P. 6,021,324), Muhonen (U.S.P. 6,751,472), Dugan (U.S.P. 6,779,030), Yatsukawa (U.S.P. 6,148,404), and newly-cited art Davidson ("CEBus: A New Standard in Home Automation")

In item 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 9, 11 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes and in item 12 of the Office Action rejects independent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Yatsukawa. In items 8-15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 2-8, 10, 12-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes in view of combinations of Buffam, Sizer, II, Muhonen, Dugan, Yatsukawa, and Davidson.

The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that features recited by each of the independent claims are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination.

Independent claim 18, as amended herein, recites "a single operating terminal, in a device control system having a device control server interconnected over a home network with a plurality of different types of devices within-the home network, capable of transmitting instruction signals relating to operations of one or more of said plurality of different types of devices to said plurality of devices, the single operating terminal comprising: . . . storing a unique identifier; . . . registering said identifier on said device control server; . . . accepting input of instructions relating to operation of said one or more of said plurality of different types of devices that are connected on the network; . . . generating instruction information based on inputted instructions accepted by said input acceptance means and on an identifier stored in said identifier storage means; and . . . transmission of instruction information generated. (emphasis added)."

Independent claims 1, 11, and 22-23 have similar recitations.

That is, according to an aspect of the present invention, instruction information from a single operating terminal is directly received by a device connected on the home network.

The Examiner asserts that Holmes teaches:

CEBus communications protocol to monitor and control devices in a house (col. 3, lines 38-50). CEBus standard is a home network standard; therefore, the home automation system disclosed by Holmes is a CEBus home network on which the home devices and appliances

are connected.

(Action at page 5).

In support of the rejection, the Examiner further asserts that the operating terminal according to the present invention is taught by Holmes as illustrated in FIG. 1 elements 10, 12, 26. (Action at page 10).

Applicants submit however, that, Holmes does not teach a single operating terminal transmitting instruction signals relating to operations of one or more of said plurality of different types of devices to said plurality of devices, and wherein both the terminal and the plurality of devices are on the home network.

By contrast, Holmes merely teaches in col. 3, lines 18-36:

The application interface 22 translates data, which may include commands, between the mobile station 10 or wired network 24 and the application equipment 26.

(Emphasis added).

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 1, 9, 11, 18, and 22-23 (and respective dependent claims 2-8, 10, 12-17, and 19-21) are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-9 and 11-24 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 25, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501